UNITY

FREEDOM, FELLOWSHIP AND CHARACTER IN RELIGION

THE UNITED STATES OF PALESTINE

[A Solution of the Arab-Jewish Problem]

Bernard A. Rosenblatt

The Man Hunt - - - - *Ellen Horup*

War and Human Behavior - *Mathias J. Fischer*

Garden Philosophy - - *R. S. Kellerman*

VOLUME CXXI NUMBER 11

Chicago, August 1, 1938

PRICE FIFTEEN CENTS

UNITY

Established 1878

(Jenkin Lloyd Jones, Editor, 1880-1918)

Published Semi-Monthly *Subscription $3.00*
Until Further Notice *Single Copies 15 cents*

UNITY PUBLISHING CO., Abraham Lincoln Centre, 700 Oakwood Blvd., Chicago, Ill.

"Entered as Second-Class Matter May 24, 1935, at the Post Office at Chicago, Illinois, under Act of March 3, 1879."

JOHN HAYNES HOLMES, *Editor* CURTIS W. REESE, *Managing Editor*

Board of Directors

MRS. S. O. LEVINSON, President
MRS. E. L. LOBDELL, Vice-President
MRS. IRWIN S. ROSENFELS, Treasurer
MRS. FRANCIS NEILSON
MRS. O. T. KNIGHT
MR. C. W. REESE
MISS MATILDA C. SCHAFF
MRS. E. E. SMITH
MR. FRANCIS NEILSON
MRS. IDA S. RANDALL
MR. JAMES E. TUCKER

Editorial Contributors

W. WALDEMAR W. ARGOW
DOROTHY WALTON BINDER
RAYMOND B. BRAGG
TARAKNATH DAS
PERCY M. DAWSON
ALBERT C. DIEFFENBACH
JAMES A. FAIRLEY
ZONA GALE
A. EUSTACE HAYDON
JESSE H. HOLMES
LOUIS L. MANN
JOSEPH ERNEST MCAFEE
M. C. OTTO
ALSON H. ROBINSON
ROBERT C. SCHALLER
FRED W. SHORTER
CLARENCE R. SKINNER
SYDNEY STRONG
ARTHUR L. WEATHERLY

Poetry Editors

LUCIA TRENT
RALPH CHEYNEY

Washington Correspondent

BRENT DOW ALLINSON

Foreign Representatives

AUSTRALIA—CHARLES STRONG
AUSTRIA—STEFAN ZWEIG
BULGARIA—P. M. MATTHÉEFF
ENGLAND—HARRISON BROWN
FRED HANKINSON
REGINALD REYNOLDS
FRANCE—G. DEMARTIAL
ROMAIN ROLLAND
GERMANY—THEODOR HAHN
INDIA—RABINDRANATH TAGORE
JAPAN—NOBUICHIRO IMAOKA
PALESTINE—HANS KOHN
RUSSIA—ALINA HUEBSCH

Contents

EDITORIAL—
Notes 163

ARTICLES—
The United States of Palestine—[A Solution of the Arab-Jewish Problem]—BERNARD A. ROSENBLATT 166
The Man Hunt—ELLEN HORUP 167
War and Human Behavior—MATHIAS J. FISCHER 171
Garden Philosophy—R. S. KELLERMAN 172

TRUMPETS ON NEW HORIZONS—
Prayer for Brains—EARL BIGELOW BROWN 174
Spain—1938—STANTON A. COBLENTZ 174
On a Hill by the Sea—[To Kagawa]—JANIE SMITH RHYNE 174
Not the Eagle—E. MERRILL ROOT 174

THE STUDY TABLE—
A Biography of the Pope—JOHN HAYNES HOLMES 174
A Study of the Psalms—C. A. HAWLEY 175

CORRESPONDENCE—
From Marcus Graham 176

THE FIELD—
Shall We Send Arms to Spain?—*Fellowship* 162
Educational Service—Bulletin of Allied Youth, Inc 176

The Field

"The world is my country, to do good is my Religion."

Shall We Send Arms to Spain?

By A. J. Muste

The one issue about which decided and passionately held differences were expressed at the recent Keep America Out of War Congress was that of lifting the present embargo against sending munitions to Spain. Trade Unionists and Socialists were almost unanimous in believing that the embargo should be lifted. On the other hand, the vast majority of members of peace organizations held that the only sound way to meet the real and admitted difficulties in the situation is not to send arms to Spain but to get the United States out of the business of making arms profit by refusing to send munitions of war to any country at any time. The Congress itself took no action on the matter.

Pacifists readily agree that the course of the Roosevelt administration in the matter is subject to severe condemnation. The embargo against munitions to Spain is enforced, while the President and Secretary of State calmly ignore the Neutrality Law as regards the much greater war between Japan and China. This latter is a much more real and dangerous case of usurpation of power by the executive than those for which Mr. Roosevelt is usually criticized by conservatives and reactionaries. And it has the support of radicals!

Many competent authorities believe that in placing an embargo against the duly constituted government of Spain long-standing international practice is violated, as well as a specific Spanish-American treaty of friendship ratified in 1902. Supplies get to Franco via Germany and Italy, while the embargo operates to deprive Loyalists of American arms.

Shall we then as pacifists agree that the way must be opened for sending munitions to the Loyalists in Spain? It seems to me the answer must be an unequivocal "No"! The case for keeping America out of war is largely based on the hideous futility and cruelty of war, the impossibility of distinguishing the innocent from the guilty, the disregard of standards of decency and morality without which no modern war can be waged. All that is as true—perhaps more true—of civil as of international war. It is as true of war in Spain as anywhere else. How then justify sending weapons to make the continuance of war possible?

Increasingly war will be civil rather than international, or rather both civil and international at once. That is the case in Spain today, where a struggle between two sets of powers for position in the next general war is going on, not a simple and clear-cut struggle between democratic and Fascist parties of Spaniards. If we are going to go in for a policy of neutrality—not selling munitions to belligerents—in international conflict but selling munitions in civil wars, there will be plenty of export trade for the war industries and a neutrality policy will be help-

(*Continued on page* 176)

UNITY

"He Hath Made of One All Nations of Men"

Volume CXXI MONDAY, AUGUST 1, 1938 No. 11

A SUMMER THOUGHT

Once in a while, . . . in our northern cities, at noon, in a very hot summer's day, one may realize, by a sudden extension in his sphere of consciousness, how closely he is shut up for the most part. Do you not remember something like this? July, between 1 and 2 p. m., Fahrenheit 96°, or thereabouts. Windows all gaping, like the mouths of panting dogs. Long, stinging cry of a locust comes in from a tree, half a mile off; had forgotten there was such a tree. Baby's screams from a house several blocks distant—never knew there were any babies in the neighborhood before. Tinman pounding something that clatters dreadfully—very distinct but don't remember any tinman's shop nearby. Horses stamping on pavement to get off flies. When you hear these four sounds, you may set it down as a warm day. Then it is that we would like to imitate the mode of life of the native of Sierra Leone, as somebody has described it: stroll into the market in natural costume,—buy a watermelon for a halfpenny, split it, and scoop out the middle, sit down in one-half of the empty rind, clap the other on one's head, and feast upon the pulp.

OLIVER WENDELL HOLMES,
in *The Autocrat of the Breakfast Table.*

ARMAMENTS LEAD TO DESTRUCTION!

We count it enormously significant that on the very day following President Roosevelt's prophetic statement, delivered in the presence of the great fleet at San Francisco, that the continuance of the present race of armaments could only lead to disaster, Sir John Simons warned the House of Commons in London that civilization might perish "if every country goes on piling up armaments forever and ever." The words of the English Chancellor of the Exchequer were solemn. "There have been other civilizations than ours," he said, as the Commons voted without a dissenting vote a new army, navy, and air appropriation of £350,000,000.

> Tut-ankh-Amen was forgotten until he was dug up and it is very possible that the things that are protecting our civilization are more slender than they are sometime thought to be.
>
> This country has the resources of character, courage, and history which will see it through. But make no mistake—if we do not succeed and the world does not succeed in finding some way to end the folly of this everlasting expenditure on armaments, then, indeed, the future we shall be preparing for our children is one at which we may shudder.

Here, right out of official lips, is the word of the pacifist—that armaments lead not to security and life but to insecurity and death. Yet, in a world organized on the basis of force and violence, these armaments are the only security that the man on the street can recognize! And no ruler of a state will take the risk of stripping his nation of arms, or of failing even to keep the pace with other nations, in such a world as now we live in. This is the dilemma of our times—the trap of death in which modern civilization is caught. The way of escape is obvious. Mankind must find by international agreement and organization a real security to put in the place of the specious security of armaments. No nation will lay down arms until that security has been found and established beyond all hazard of betrayal. Disarmament, in other words, is a secondary and not a primary issue in the great struggle for peace. It is itself far more a consequence than it is a cause of the present plight of the world, though it is nonetheless a cause of woes greater than itself, as President Roosevelt and Sir John Simons have both confessed. Meanwhile, the task of the pacifist is clear—to describe armaments for what they are, and to challenge humanity to find that higher security of good will apart from violence which can alone bring security and peace to men.

MASSACRES IN PALESTINE AGAIN

Even in these dreadful times, with bloodshed and horror all around us, the renewal of violence in Palestine holds the absorbed attention of the world. There is something so incongruous about all this hatred in the Holy Land! This feud between Jews and Arabs is so unnecessary, so irrational and futile, and yet so fierce! Behind the struggle lie truths of a momentous nature which should long since have been learned—the responsibility, for instance, of the British Empire. But just at this moment there are other aspects of the situation which have immediate significance. One is this —that there is no solution of the Palestinian problem in the Empire's partition scheme! At the very time the latest British commission was in Jerusalem, studying anew the conditions of partition, the massacres broke out afresh, with neither Jew nor Arab paying any more attention to the commission than to a sand grain in the desert. In the midst of such realities as pertain in Palestine today, the partition proposal of Britain simply does not count. All it has done, or can do, is to divide the Jews hopelessly against one an-

other, and to unite the Arabs in a fiercer antagonism than ever against Zion. It is high time that the partition scheme were dropped! Another truth about bleeding Palestine today is this, that the homeland of the Jews offers no adequate relief to the Jewish exiles now pouring out of Germany and Austria. In the recent Zionist Conference in Detroit, Rabbi Wise declared that the Evian Conference on the refugee problem, if it was to succeed, must open up the gates of Palestine to immigration from tortured Europe. This is true! The immigration restrictions now prevailing in the Holy Land against the floods of hopeless Jews fleeing the terrors of the Nazis, themselves constitute one of the supreme horrors of the times. Palestine must be used to save refugee Jews to the very limit of its opportunities. But even at the best Palestine is not adequate to meet the situation. And now Palestine, with death and destruction loose again, is at its worst! Which means that, if the Jews of the Reich are to be saved, they must be received through open gates not only by Palestine but by America and other free nations of the world! Here lies the challenge to Evian and the permanent commission happily appointed by that body.

ENGLAND WITHDRAWS FROM IRELAND

The most conspicuous news is not always the most important. Amid the wars and rumors of wars, the political struggles and economic stresses which vex our time, there came a report some days ago which we seriously regard as more momentous than anything jostling for front-page space and screaming headlines—certainly more heartening at this dread hour and more hopefully prophetic for the future! We refer to the scene at Cork harbor in Ireland on July 14th last, when the Union Jack was hauled down over Spike Island and the British garrison withdrawn from the fort located for centuries at this historic gateway to the Atlantic. Who could have imagined in the grim days following the War, when Ireland writhed under the martial law of the Blacks and Tans, and English and Irish slaughtered one another in one furious feud of destruction and death, that within less than two decades Irish and English troops would stand side by side in amity, an Irish band playing "God Save the King" while the English regiments hauled down their colors and sailed away? For more than seven hundred years, England strove with every known method of force, violence, and terror to conquer and subdue the Irish people. England fought them, defeated them, imprisoned and murdered them, exploited and plundered them, held them in bondage like slaves in chains, but the Irish would not give in. Always there were conspiracies against the hated English, uprisings and rebellions, and again and again open warfare. Hatred raged on both sides—never in history was there a more furious antagonism between two peoples. What is conspicuous in this dreadful story is not only the horror but the futility of it all. For all her majesty and might, her immeasurable military power, England never got anywhere with this little island off her shores. Violence was vain! Then, in the exhaustion following the Great War, and in mutual revulsion against the Black and Tan regime, there came a change. Reconciliation began. Force was abandoned for good will; hatred was softened into mutual regard and respect. Now Ireland, after all these centuries, is *free*—and at the same time bound more closely to England than at any time when she lay bound and bleeding at her feet. England at last has conquered Ireland not by the sword but by the spirit. It's the old lesson that there is no victory save in surrender, no triumph save in love. When will the world learn—and end at last its woes?

THE BOOT ON THE OTHER LEG

The American Civil Liberties Union has through twenty years of impartial, unprejudiced, courageous fighting built up for itself the reputation of being the foremost champion of civil rights in this country. It has never failed to come to the relief of any one, however humble or even disreputable, who has been denied full freedom of speech and press, as see its annual report just issued. In the very necessities of the case, its clients have frequently been Socialists, Communists, and other radicals who have of course been the first to suffer the worst at the hands of reactionary public authorities. It has been this insistence of the Union upon defending the liberties of those whom no one else would defend which has besmeared it at the hands of bigoted opponents with the charge of being "red." But the Union has championed quite as vigorously individuals and groups of quite a different stamp—as, for example, Roman Catholics, Jehovah's Witnesses, Ku Klux Klanners, and now capitalistic employers under indictment of the National Labor Relations Act. This last instance is interesting! Under the terms of the Wagner Act (as the law is popularly called), especially as administered by the National Labor Relations Board, employers are denied the right to state any opposition to or criticism of trade unionism to their employes, to distribute circulars among them, to communicate with them in any way, shape, or manner. The employer within the area of his factory, and among the people on his payroll, must keep absolutely silent on all matters at issue between them. Recently, for example, an employer was indicted by the N. L. R. Board, and will in due course be punished, for the heinous offense of distributing among his employes a speech by a Congressman attacking the C. I. O. If this isn't a denial of free speech, we should like to know what such denial is. How long will it be before radio stations will be denied the right to give time to opponents of the C. I. O. and other labor interests, or editors denied the

right to print articles, or ministers to publish sermons stating honest views on labor questions? We are all for trade unionism. We believe the Wagner Act to be in many ways the most progressive and beneficent piece of legislation in behalf of labor ever enacted in this country. But here is suppression of free speech—and we protest. And so does the Civil Liberties Union, which, "red" as it may be, has challenged the N. L. R. Board, and demanded that it explain its actions.

CHURCH STATISTICS—POVERTY VS. WEALTH

We find in the *Churchman* (June 15th) a statement of income received by twenty-five Protestant communions in 1929-37, as reported by the United Stewardship Council of New York. Twenty-three of these communions are in the United States, and two in Canada. The figures are as follows:

Year	*Total Gifts for All Purposes*	*Total Gifts for Congregational Expenses*
1929	$514,992,105	$406,069,808
1930	507,491,165	401,213,150
1931	475,685,894	382,090,994
1932	418,621,531	338,302,278
1933	348,715,381	284,070,331
1934	299,416,781	246,232,501
1935	304,692,499	251,347,435
1936	315,438,747	258,167,763
1937	330,040,935	272,964,746

The following table shows the trend of per capita giving through these years:

Year	*All Purposes*	*Congregational Purposes*
1929	$22.04	$17.38
1930	23.38	18.08
1931	22.62	17.67
1932	19.02	14.56
1933	16.11	12.70
1934	12.07	9.92
1935	12.10	9.98
1936	12.46	10.20
1937	13.25	10.96

The depressing side of these figures is shown in the catastrophic decline in giving from 1929 to 1934. The cheering side of the statistics is seen in the recovery of giving from 1934 to 1937, coincident with the recovery of business. Evidently just as soon as people began to get more income, they began sharing again with the church. But there remains the fact that the gain in these latter years represents no real recovery of the terrific loss following the collapse of 1929. And now we are in the midst of a second depression, which will probably reduce these figures again to the low levels of 1934—and perhaps even lower! That the income of these denominations will ever get back to the top totals of 1929 is altogether doubtful. This is sad, financially—but is it not sound, spiritually? Do we want to return to the mad days of the Harding-Coolidge era, and is it a good thing for the church to share in the money debaucheries of such a time? Has a church any right to be rich? Can it do its truly religious work if it shares too abundantly in the profits of a profit-making civilization? Everett R. Clinchy has just warned American churches against the deceitfulness of riches. "Watch lest the churches become too rich," he says. "Let the churches avoid such degree of entanglement with the *status quo* as to become apologists for things as they are and neglect their prophetic function." Perhaps in an experience of poverty will come the religious revival we have been hearing so much about.

TWO GREAT JEWS

Two of the world's greatest Jews died on July 9th last—one in this country and the other in England. The former, Supreme Court Justice Benjamin Cardozo, was a descendant of two distinguished Jewish families—on his mother's side, of Rabbi Gersham Seixas, a Sephardic Jew who came to America from Portugal in 1654 and became one of the first trustees of Kings College (now Columbia University), on his father's side, of Aaron Cardozo, a London merchant who settled in New York in 1752. The latter, Dr. Claude Goldsmid-Montefiore, was a son of two of the most eminent Jewish families in England, as signalized by his compound name. These two Jews were equally the glory of their race and outstanding among the leaders of their time. Cardozo, with his Jewish colleague, Louis Brandeis, was one of the two greatest jurists of the present hour. Had he not been a judge of supreme intelligence and learning, he would have been a literary figure of immortal fame. His opinions and other writings in the law are as notable from the literary as from the legal point of view. Cardozo's inexhaustible scholarship was matched by a liberality of spirit and courage of judgment which made him a pioneer in the task of adapting legal forms to evolving social needs. An exquisite gentleman, the essence of culture, refinement, and true chivalry, quiet, modest, shy, he was notable in any company as a great mind clothed in wisdom as a garment. Montefiore was likewise a scholar, famous as Hibbert lecturer at Oxford in 1892, author of many books in the religious field, trusted leader of his own people and reconciler by voice and pen of Jews and Christians together. More than any other English Jew, Montefiore was responsible for the liberal or reform Judaism of Britain which holds so influential a position in the religious life of our time. His researches into Jewish literature and his studies of the Synoptic Gospels and kindred Christian writings were alike outstanding. His noble stature of mind and spirit was matched by his noble physical presence. Amid the raging anti-Semitism of this hour, and the snarling prejudice and contempt of Jews, so prevalent even among those who would deny the taint of anti-Semitism, we think of these two men who make ridiculous every charge directed against their brethren. Glorious and indispensable to mankind is any race which can produce such sons.

The United States of Palestine

[A Solution of the Arab-Jewish Problem]

BERNARD A. ROSENBLATT*

The prime requisite of Palestine today is *immigration.* It is the very life blood of the Jewish National Home, and it is an essential condition for Palestine's prosperity from which both Arab and Jew will equally benefit. To the Jew there is the added factor of keeping the door open for his persecuted brethren of Eastern and Central Europe, in these days of Nazi madness; but even from the point of view of Palestine itself, free Jewish immigration is the *sine qua non* of its expanding economy. Just as big America was prosperous before the War, largely as a result of free European immigration during the preceding century, so has little Palestine, *since* the World War, illustrated the general principle that immigration and prosperity are twin brothers in the development of any country free from the stage of primitive barbarism to modern civilization.

Unfortunately, the Arabs, who have as much to gain as the Jews from a policy of free immigration, have been deluded into the belief that they may be swamped by Jewish immigration, even though the rate of increase in the Arab population has never been greater than during the last decade and a half. But the unreasonable fears of a population constitute a factor that must be taken into account by realistic thinkers and statesmen. It is the fear of Jewish domination among the Arabs, prompted likewise by the insidious propaganda of some European powers in their drive against Great Britain, that has disturbed the peace of Palestine for the past two years, reacting upon its economy, and, therefore, automatically restricting Jewish immigration. In short, we must have peace *plus* immigration as the permanent policy for Palestine. We dare not sacrifice immigration for a mere mess of peace pottage, since this will bring only a temporary truce and may result in reducing the Jews to a minority status in their ancient Homeland—a veritable ghetto in the old land of Israel. Rather than suffer such a condition to arise in Palestine, with the recent memory of the meaning of minority status in Poland, Germany, and Rumania before us, the Jews of Palestine will prefer war to a peace that "is no peace."

So it behooves us to examine carefully the whole situation in the hope of finding a path to peace *with* immigration. For that purpose, a group of prominent Jews in Haifa, where Arabs and Jews most frequently meet for business and social relations, have spontaneously organized themselves into a committee to seek the bridge of peace between Jews and Arabs in Palestine. In the midst of the debate over the partition of Palestine, the solution of "Federalism," which this committee has proposed, has come like a breath from the Mediterranean Sea over a parched Palestine, suffering from the hot desert wind known as the "Hamsin."

To put the whole matter in a nutshell, the Haifa Committee peace plan envisages the establishment of two states—Jewish and Arab—cemented into a Federal union of Palestine and Trans-Jordan, with a British mandate over the Holy places of Nazareth, Old Jerusalem, and Bethlehem; each state, following the American precedent, to be sovereign in all its internal affairs, with a legislature or parliament to control its domestic economy, while both would unite in delegating certain *limited* powers to a Federal Union for the purpose of developing a common foreign policy based upon a *pact of perpetual peace and friendship with Great Britain.* This Federal Union, of specific and delegated powers, might be controlled by a Federal Council or Senate to which each state would send two senators (again following the American precedent) but presided over by the High Commissioner over the British mandated territory, who would act as chairman of the Federal Council. Such a senate or council would have full power over foreign affairs and matters of defense, and would also provide for a common system of currency, customs, and interstate commerce and communications, leaving all other matters *not so delegated,* including the all-important subject of immigration and the whole field of civil and criminal law, for each state to determine in its own way.

We have sometimes been asked how this system differs from the suggested system of Cantonization. None of us is interested in engaging in verbal disputes, nor have we any pride of authorship, but Cantonization is insufficient, because it evidently implies a system in which the emphasis is rather upon the Central Government, where the Cantons may be reduced to mere provinces for local self-government. The forty-eight American states have far more powers than any Canton of Switzerland or Province in the Dominion of Canada. The Jewish State must be free to select its own officials in place of administrators imported from Europe, Africa, and Asia (often ignorant of local conditions) to rule over a population of European Jews.

More important still is the fundamental problem of immigration. If Cantonization means any restriction of immigration whatsoever by a Central or General Government, it will be solidly rejected by the Jews of Palestine who will never surrender the premise in the report of the Royal Commission of last July in which they are guaranteed that, at least in their little Jewish State, they will be sole masters of their fate. Once the Jewish flag has been raised over a territory whose future we may determine, through a policy of free and relatively unrestricted immigration, we shall never accept Cantonization, for we can never again permit any foreign power, however benevolent, to determine our immigration policy, whether on the basis of a political high level or even economic absorptive capacity. We alone must determine the economic absorptive capacity in the Jewish State when the whole world is closed to the Jewish people. The Federal Government of Palestine may provide conditions of residence, between the states, for Jews and Arabs, and permits for traveling for business or pleasure between the states, but immigration into the Jewish State must remain a matter to be dealt with solely by the legislature or parliament of that state, even as the Arab State may determine its own absorptive capacity within its own boundaries.

*A New York judge, a Zionist, now resident in Palestine.—*Editor.*

The two sister states—Jewish and Arab—will have well defined boundaries, but no barbed wire fences must separate them into warring territories. On the contrary, we shall follow the good American principle of free trade and freedom of transport and communication from one state into the other—even as the George Washington Bridge connects New York and New Jersey, while the metropolis of Kansas City sits astride the river which separates—or rather unites—the two states of Missouri and Kansas.

In such a system of equal states, it must be to the interest of all that the area of each state should be sufficient for proper development. The Arab State would naturally comprise all of Trans-Jordan except the corner near Lake Tiberias, as well as the triangle enclosed by Jenin, Tulkerem and Ramallah (south of Nablus and north of Jerusalem), while the Jewish State would include the whole of Galilee, Emek Israel, the coastline and the Sharon Valley, running south of Rehoboth, with a swing east to include the environs of the New Jerusalem (the district built by the Jews after the war). The South, including the Negeb, might very well be constituted as a Federal territory (following the American precedent) with equal access to both Jews and Arabs; while the British mandate over the Holy sites would serve to unite the whole country. There can be no objection to Jaffa remaining a port of the Arab State, even though it may be reached only by sea from the Arab territory and by land only in passing through the Jewish district—a privilege that sister states in America offer as a matter of course. (For example, a citizen of Michigan, traveling from Detroit to the Upper Peninsula, which otherwise can be reached only by water, usually prefers the land route across the sister state of Wisconsin.)

It is only through the organization of such a Federal Union of Palestine—a United States of Palestine, if you will—that we can induce the Arabs of Palestine to look toward Haifa and Jerusalem rather than to Damascus and Baghdad. Instead of a Confederation of Arab states in which the Arabs of Palestine must necessarily play second fiddle, they are here offered an equal union with the Jews in the great task of transforming the Holy Land once more into a unique country with a historic role to play, as the intermediary between East and West, the bridge connecting three continents.

The Arab State of this Federal Union would in all probability be a kingdom ruled by Emir Abdullah, while the Jewish State would be a republic governed by its own parliament. This might be reminiscent of the old German Empire before the War, which included within its boundaries republics like Hamburg and Bremen, as well as kingdoms like Bavaria; yet under the beneficent protection of Great Britain, who would necessarily act as the agent of the Federal Union in all foreign affairs. Palestine might grow into a permanent union that will win the respect of mankind.

The Haifa Committee presents a peace plan which preserves an *undivided Palestine,* with state rights on the American model, which will safeguard Arab rights, while offering to the Jews the opportunity to play their unique role as the intermediary between the Occident and the Orient. At the same time, Great Britain will win the gratitude and support of a Federated Palestine with a hinterland to protect the trade routes from Haifa which have already become the connecting link in the British Empire.

The Man Hunt

ELLEN HORUP

On October 26, 1933, James G. McDonald was nominated High Commissioner for the Refugees Coming from Germany by the League Council. He resigned his mandate in a letter dated December 27, 1935. This letter is the confession of an honest man that he was helpless before the problems he had been asked to solve. It is a document which shows that there are still people with understanding and compassion, and a will to justice. It is moreover a proof that the forces represented by McDonald today carry on a vain struggle against those who rule the world.

The letter closes with a public condemnation of the policies which cause "desperate suffering in the countries adjacent to Germany, and even more terrible human calamity within the German frontiers. . . When domestic policies threaten the demoralization and exile of hundreds of thousands of human beings, considerations of diplomatic correctness must yield to those of common humanity."

He was among the first to demonstrate publicly against the treatment of the German refugees. But has such a demonstration ever any effect? The first Inter-Governmental Conference on the Right of Asylum, held in July, 1936, may probably be considered as a consequence of McDonald's resignation, which was also perhaps not unconnected with Germany's departure from the League of Nations.

This Conference was preceded by a Preparatory Conference convened by the interested organizations in Paris. At this Conference de Brouckère, President of the Second International, proclaimed the right of the refugees to a passport, the right to live, to work, and to fight for their ideas. "The political refugees are today in many countries helpless in the hands of the all-powerful police. . . We must remember the rôle political refugees have played in world history. Today we need them also, to build a new world, a world of democracy, socialism, and peace. We demand legal protection for them."

The Conference on the Right of Asylum in Geneva, on the other hand, was a Conference of Governments, at which most countries were represented by government officials. Norway sent the man best fitted for the task, Michael Hansson of the Nansen Office. Switzerland, Belgium, and Holland sent police experts.

The Conference was not a public one; a few delegations were, however, admitted, such as representatives of the Paris Preparatory Conference, the Jewish organizations, etc.

De Brouckère was supported at the Geneva Conference by the French delegate and by Michael Hansson. In the course of an attack on one of the elastic clauses in the High Commissioner's draft Convention, the Swiss delegate interrupted with the remark: "You

lack the police spirit, M. de Brouckère, you are an idealist." It was indeed the police spirit which triumphed there, as it does in everything that touches the refugee problem. Elastic clauses and ambiguity characterize the Geneva Convention, but there is not the slightest sign of idealism or even humanity.

What the Conference should have decided on above all else was a fully valid substitute for the German passport, which the refugee either does not possess, or it has expired and is therefore worthless to him. He needs a paper which proves his identity and gives him freedom of movement; for a person without a passport is nobody, he has no right to exist.

This was the subject under discussion at the Conference—this identity paper and the permission to reside. The document which was finally agreed upon in the provisional Convention is a traveling passport, which the signatory State grants to the German refugee in so far as he stays legally in the country. It gives the possessor the right to move freely within the borders of the country, and to return to it if he has been abroad. It is made out for a year and can always be prolonged for six months. It *can* (but not necessarily must) be given to refugees who at the time of the signing of the Convention were living illegally in the country, if they report within a certain time limit. Stateless persons, and also persons who even if of German nationality are subjects of another country, do not come within the scope of this refugee passport.

But for a foreigner to be able to live in a country he needs a *permit to reside*. The traveling passport has nothing to do with that. The refugee, then, does not get the latter because he is already in possession of the former, and vice versa. If permission to reside is refused he must leave the country, even if he has the right, according to the refugee passport granted him, to circulate freely in that same land. But in order to quit one country he must necessarily go to another, which in turn depends on whether this other country, as stated in the Convention, is disposed to allow him to enter and to grant him a visa. In this way the refugee may find himself in the absurd situation of, on the one hand, being allowed only to travel in a country where he is not allowed to stay, while all the others refuse him permission either to enter or to stay in their territory.

Then the police of two, generally friendly, countries begin to play hide and seek with one another. The police of a given country set the refugee secretly over the frontier at night, and just as secretly the police of the other country bring him back,—until in the end, the victim of this horrible game brings it to a close with an act of despair, as did, for instance, the refugee who was smuggled so often over a frontier bridge that finally he sat down in the middle of it to be left in peace. As nobody took any more notice of him, after two days of hunger and cold he threw himself into the river. . .

Similar experience has been the lot of many, whether they possessed the refugee passport or not. For this document, like the Nansen passport, is practically worthless as a traveling passport, no country being obliged to grant a visa for it. As to acting as a protection against expulsion, it is absolutely valueless. Professor Quidde says of these expulsions, "They have unfortunately only too often been practised," and in his article "Help for Pacifists" (*Die Friedenswarte*, 1938, No. 3/4), he cites the case of a pacifist who was expelled from no less than eight countries, including France.

From February 7 to 10, 1938, a new Inter-Governmental Conference was held in Geneva, which replaced the provisional Convention of 1936 by a new International Statute for Refugees. The results were both good and bad, but on the whole bad.

In the new definition, stateless persons are also included in the refugees from Germany, in so far as they were regularly domiciled in Germany. This is doubtless a gain, since these stateless persons are now able to obtain the refugee passport. For the rest, the legal part of the new Statute incorporates in the main the text of the provisional Convention of 1936.

Already at that time a provision had been made which robbed the refugee of any legal protection with regard to the country of asylum. It reappears in the new Statute in Article 5, which says that a refugee can only be expelled or reconducted for "reasons of national security or public order." This provision, however, delivers him bound hand and foot to all administrative and police arbitrary decisions. A veritable right of asylum carries the guaranty that no one can be expelled so long as he has not violated the penal laws of the country.

The Coördination Committee set up by the High Commissariat, which represents 25 national and international relief organizations for refugees from Germany, sent 6 representatives to the Conference, amongst whom was de Brouckère (Belgium), at the same time Vice-President of the Conference. These representatives expressed grave doubts concerning the passage referred to. The British delegate associated himself with them and declared that his Government would resort to expulsion measures only after a court sentence, or in the event of serious wrongdoing or an offense against public morals. But who is to say what constitutes an "offense against public morals," and if the wrongdoing is sufficiently serious to incur expulsion?

But far worse provisions were incorporated in the new Statute. The same Article 5, paragraph 3, on the proposal of the Dutch delegate presiding over the Conference, lays down: "The High Contracting Parties undertake not to reconduct refugees to German territory unless they have been warned and have refused, without just cause, to make the necessary arrangements to proceed to another territory or to take advantage of the arrangements made for them with that object." The last phrase was adopted on the proposal of the Belgian Government representative. That was too much for de Brouckère; he resigned his presidency and left the Conference to its "police spirit" and its elastic clauses.

That incorrigible optimist, Professor Quidde, draws some slight comfort from the fact that the measure only takes effect if the refugee refuses to leave the country "without just cause." But in order to prove bad faith one must be able to see into the mind of a person, and perhaps that had better be left to God rather than to a policeman. What refugee will deliberately refuse to make the necessary arrangements and therebv risk being given up to the Gestapo? It is not bad faith that drives him to stay in the country, but simply the impossibility of legally entering another!

The Conference, therefore, did not even succeed in

compelling the States under no circumstances to surrender a refugee to the Government from which he had fled.

As to the *permit to work,* which alone gives substance to the permit to reside, the Statute took over the relevant provisions of the Nansen Convention of 1933. They lay down that the provisions for the protection of the national labor market shall not be applied in all their severity to the refugees, and that after three years they shall be completely abolished. Here also there is not the slightest legal protection for the refugee. How the "reduced severity" is to be interpreted is left to the purely administrative sphere, that is, to the arbitrary decisions of the Ministries of Justice, Police, and Labor combined. This collaboration has resulted in the refugees being granted the permit to work only in exceptional cases. In order to bind the Governments as little as possible, even if it is only on paper, they were left the possibility of signing only the provisions concerning passports and permission to reside, leaving aside the clauses with regard to permission to work and social protection. (The Nansen Convention, on the contrary, was signed with these provisions included.)

There is a slight advantage in the new Statute as against the provisional Convention of 1936, and that is that whereas in the earlier case denunciation of the Convention—which could of course be made at any time—took effect after only 45 days, in the later one this delay is extended to one year.

So much for the factual content of this formal document, whose main features were formulated by two of the most reactionary juridical experts. No one can fail to conclude that extremely little was achieved for the refugees. And although this Convention for the protection of the refugees gives rather the impression that it is designed to protect States against the refugees, not all the countries that were represented at the Conference have yet signed it.

The Governments of Switzerland and Czechoslovakia made a reservation to put the Convention first to the test. Their representatives signed only the Final Act, a kind of protocol about the work of the Conference. The delegates of Sweden, Portugal, and Cuba did likewise. The Polish delegate would not even sign the Final Act, which is not binding in any way. Of the 14 members of the Conference (the United States, Yugoslavia and Finland sent only observers), only 7 signed the Convention; and of the 7 signatory States, not one signed without reservations.

In Holland and Denmark refugees are expressly forbidden to earn their living. They may come into the country and stay there, until they are expelled. When that should happen is decided by the police. They may live only on charity. They are forbidden to beg. Nowhere do they have any rights. Holland, not satisfied with the far-reaching concessions of the Convention to the power of the police, reserves the right to give the refugees up in every case to the German Government.

England virtuously signifies as grounds for expulsion "offenses in matters relating to morals."

Furthermore, all the countries took great care that their Colonies and Protectorates should not be considered as places of refuge for the refugees. Even Denmark appeared in the character of a Colonial Power and protected Greenland against the refugees. France was the only country that limited itself to this reservation.

Belgium signed the Convention of 1936 as well as that of 1938. In practice, however, according to the Belgian expulsion regulations, permission to reside is granted only to those refugees who come to Belgium direct from Germany. Others have not even the right to bring their case before the Inter-Ministerial Commission for Refugees. Should they invoke the right of asylum and the Geneva Convention, they are told: "We are not obliged to grant you permission to stay. . ."

While the Governments hold conferences, Fascist dictatorship is being introduced in one country after another, and the ranks of the exiled and degraded are steadily increasing. In Vienna plunder, imprisonment, terrorization, and murder reign supreme. Thousands are being sent to concentration camps; quite a number have left these camps dead men. The *Daily Chronicle* states that there have been 5,000 suicides; the Jewish newspapers estimate the number at 6,000. Thousands of others, in an effort to escape death and suicide, try to leave the country. Many of them are not only relieved at the frontier of their last coins; even their passports are taken away from them and torn up.

About a tenth of the Austrian population—Jews, Catholics, Socialists, Communists, democrats, pacifists, supporters of Schuschnigg and monarchists—are abandoned to plunder and violence; and while the army of refugees not only from Austria but also from the now threatened Czechoslovakia gradually swells, the democratic countries close their frontiers.

Until the annexation of Austria, France was the best land of asylum for the refugees. Many were allowed to work, and not a single one was ever reconducted back to Germany. The Consulates, however, whose personnel does not change even under the Popular Front, worked against the humanitarian attitude of the French Government, by refusing to give visas to the refugees wishing to enter the country in a legal way. The refugees were thus compelled against their will to resort to illegal means. These refugees living "illegally" in the country, in particuar the anti-Fascist Italians, are now the object of mass expulsion—the Italians probably as a sacrifice to the Franco-Italian agreement.

The French frontiers are now practically closed. On instructions from Paris, the French authorities brought back to the French frontier many Jewish refugees who had fled during the National-Socialist looting of Vienna, because they possessed neither money nor passports nor other identity papers. A group of 40 other Austrian refugees were allowed to remain in France. In addition, 36 women and 2 children were permitted to stay in the hospital at Thionville. What happened to the rest of them is not known. Three of the reconducted Austrian Jews tried to drown themselves as they crossed the Mosel Bridge; another attempted to open a vein with a piece of glass. All four were prevented from carrying out their designs, and were thus delivered safe and sound to their fate, which they feared yet more than death.

Switzerland, the most obvious land of refuge for the Austrian refugees, has re-introduced the obligation for the visa of Austrian passports, declaring that Switzerland can only be considered as a land of transit for the refugees from Austria, and has given her Consulates instructions accordingly. Another means of protection against the refugees is her interpretation of the definition of refugee. During the discussion of one of the elastic clauses in the Convention, which excludes from

recognition as refugees all those who "leave Germany for reasons of purely personal convenience," the Swiss delegate explained that by this must be understood economic reasons and tax and military service evasion. Robbed of their fortunes, deprived of their means of livelihood by the National Socialists and condemned to starve in Germany, are the Jews now to be refused the right of asylum? Are the victims of the new Germany's racial phobia not political refugees?

Holland, which already holds the record both for reservations in regard to the Convention and for the reconduction of refugees back to Germany, at the end of March of this year imposed certain regulations which mean the virtual closing of Dutch frontiers to Austrian Jews. Conditions for entry include: (1) possession of a passport valid for at least two more months, and a declaration from the German authorities that the passport holder can return freely to Germany (!!); (2) proof that the applicants for temporary sojourn possess at least 500 schillings . . . those who wish to settle permanently must have at least 10,000 gulden (!!).

The small State of Luxemburg has shown itself more hospitable toward Austrian refugees than the other countries. But when the refugees poured into the country, pressure from the side of Germany became too strong. A part of the refugees were brought back to the German frontier, and now Luxemburg has strengthened her frontier guards.

England, as usual, wishes to be as generous as possible—and so sent most of the Austrian refugees that landed in English ports either to Holland or France. The British Government will, of course, willingly grant visas to refugees, but permission to reside will then depend on the "personality and the circumstances of the holder of the passport." If he has not got a passport—and that is the case with practically all the new refugees—he will not be allowed to enter. And if the port authorities do not like the cut of his face, or his political opinions, he will likewise not be allowed to enter. (For the rest, the faces of these passportless, moneyless, and persecuted unfortunates do not find favor with a single policeman in the world.)

In Belgium, also, the Minister of Justice in May ordered a strict watch to be kept on the frontiers. The reasons given were the measures taken by Switzerland, France, and Holland, which had resulted in the whole stream of refugees being directed towards Belgium. He added: "Everyone who comes to Belgium illegally will be returned to the frontier."

Do the police authorities of Europe really imagine that every refugee can pass over the German frontier complete with a regularly visaed German passport and equipped with large sums of money?

The conclusions to be drawn from the experiences of the refugees can be expressed in a few words. The last traces of the right of asylum have disappeared. All the European countries have been transformed from countries of asylum to countries of transit. With the exception of France, the only aim from the first has been to get rid of the refugees as quickly as possible. And then the hunt begins. The refugees are harassed by the police in every possible way. They are called constantly to the police station (in Denmark, for instance, a refugee had to report to the police 75 times in the course of a year). They are requested to leave, pursued with threats, insulted because they have not yet gone, or insulted because, above all, they have come, imprisoned, conducted to the frontiers by the police, thrown like a ball hither and thither by the police of different countries, driven to despair and suicide. Michael Hansson, the Norwegian delegate to the Geneva Conference, said of these persecutions, "They are often so contrary to ordinary reason and the most elementary justice that they may truly be called brutal—to such extent do they bear the character of a wild beast hunt."

That is the fate of the German refugees. They are treated like outcasts of humanity, like criminals, always under police surveillance. It was so before the Conference, and it has been so since. The improvements that are down on paper are an illusion. There is no legal protection for the refugee. There is nothing but the arbitrary power of the police.

Why are the German refugees so unjustly and so callously treated? Why are people who were persecuted in the Third Reich subjected to further persecution in democratic countries? Are they reactionaries or supporters of dictatorships? Are they enemies of democracy and progress? They have done nothing in their own country which is contrary to the laws or constitution of the democratic countries to which they have fled. The refugees are those German citizens who were opposed to the suppression of the democratic constitution of their country and who were driven out by the destroyers of that constitution. Or else they are people who have been degraded to the rank of pariahs because of their race, who are plundered, and left to a slow death.

All these people, who one might have thought would have aroused sympathy and a readiness to help in the democratic countries to which they have turned, are considered as outcasts there, too. Why? Did not even the White Russians find just that sympathy and succor in the democratic countries which are now being withheld from the Germans? They experienced need and distress, but they were spared the man hunt to which the German refugees are now subjected. Can one not demand of the democracies that those who have been driven out because they were democrats should receive at least the same treatment as those who were put to flight because they fought for Czarist reaction?

The situation of the German refugees is desperate, and cries aloud for a solution. The United States has therefore taken the initiative in calling a Conference to study the possibilities of such a solution. If something effective is to be achieved, the nations must decide on the following three things: (1) The obligation for every country to take a specified number of refugees, according to its area and population, and to give them permanent hospitality, in order to put an end to this terrible man hunt; (2) the right, which should be incorporated in national and international law, of *every* refugee to an internationally recognized passport and to the necessary visas; (3) a general permit to work for *all* refugees.

Let us hope that the outcasts will once again be integrated in society, that the outlawed will again enjoy legal protection, that the homeless will once more find a home.

"For none of us liveth to himself, and no man dieth to himself."

—*Rom.* xiv. 7

War and Human Behavior

MATHIAS J. FISCHER

The vast majority of people abhor war and earnestly want peace. The yearning for peace exists abundantly in every nation at the same time that wars are being fought and preparations are universally made for the wars of the future. This has been so throughout the centuries and bids fair to continue *unless a change is made in human functioning;* for it must be clearly evident that the effect, called war, has its cause in the aggregate net behavior of human beings.

The real problem for the peace movement then is to "isolate" that cause and reveal its composition to the peace-loving majority. It is obvious even in advance of this revelation that we who compose this majority group of peace lovers will be found to be more or less unwitting contributors to the cause of wars, so that we as reformers will be confronted by ourselves as culprits in the action of peace *vs.* war It is in this sense that the statement is so profoundly right that peace can only be had if we are willing to pay its high price—its price being: improved ethics of the individuals forming the group.

Of course, this problem of "isolating" the war germ is an enormous one even after we have set ourselves to the task of making the necessary effort. Right-minded people, however, will not be frightened by its magnitude and difficulties, for the tremendous importance of accomplishment merits extreme and unrelenting efforts. The arduous task confronting the scientist to find the cause of a disease and the seemingly insurmountable obstacles that the inventor of the airplane, radio transmission, etc., had to face, ought to inspire confidence in the peace advocate that he too will find success at the end of a long period of effort. Much research has been made quietly by humanitarians in the past, just as the scientist or inventor quietly worked in his laboratory often for long periods and confronted by many disappointments before his labors resulted in the accomplished benefit to mankind.

A profound and intense search for the motivating principle in this matter of cause and effect will soon, I believe, bring to light the indisputable fact that our private and public morality is ethically insufficient.

Our toleration of the misery, suffering, and injustices touching the lives of millions of underprivileged human beings, at the same time that we see a superabundance of comforts and riches enjoyed by the comparably few, is proof of our callousness and indifference to basic human rights—evidence of our low moral standards. I am not unaware of, nor do I fail to consider, the enormous relief and charitable efforts made by society, but I look upon them as palliatives to relieve the disease, which disease under our system is first permitted to infect human society. The chief consideration in this connection is that the underprivileged are degraded to the humiliating status of objects of charity, instead of being accorded their rightful claim to self-respect.

The church has for centuries been our main instrument for the development of the moral standard. It must bear its share of the responsibility for the failure society has to record in this sphere. Some of its leaders have accepted that responsibility and wish to meet it.

As an example, Dr. Frank Kingdon, then a minister of a Christian church and now President of the University of Newark, New Jersey, gave expression to this matter in October, 1934, as follows:

> The churches can stand until the day after doomsday, painting pictures of Paradise, but so long as they remain a part of race discrimination, war, and a barbaric economic order, they are paralyzed as far as any real message is concerned. We need a new vital interpretation of Christianity, but we won't get it from the present Christian church and leadership. The only hope is for the church to strip itself down to a fighting minority which will crusade for a decent social order.

It is precisely the deviation from sound ethical principles that creates the problems for which we have to seek solutions. But so involved and intricate are human relations that when the problem becomes acute and the solution is sought by reformers, the remoteness of the cause interferes with the understanding by the masses of the underlying connection.

Our greatest effort both in volume and time is given to the pursuit of success in business. By and large, the functioning of our business system is on the plane of selfishness. Even though it can truthfully be said that the operation of the profit system has brought immeasurable benefits to mankind, it is equally true to any free-thinking individual that it has left in its wake for mankind much misery, suffering, and crime as by-products. There are millions of human beings who of necessity must be sufferers in order that the system may function on its established basis. That is an inevitable result of the selfishness underlying our economic system. What concerns us here primarily is the relationship of that system, if any, to the cause of wars.

Broadly speaking, selfishness is unethical and, as such, productive of undesirable results upon human life. Within the nation, the effect of this selfish functioning of the profit system is sought to be controlled, and in a measure is controlled, by the exercise of our police powers under our laws. This restraint, however, must not be considered as a cure or a justification of the cause, but rather in the nature of a suppression of the right to happiness of the underprivileged individuals. The reason that this condition has been tolerated for so long and by so many human beings must be ascribed to the conviction of society that it is the best obtainable result *under existing conditions.* Indeed, I believe, that such a judgment is warranted by the facts.

What we have been loath to consider, however, is that existing conditions might be changed. The task of changing them has seemed, and still seems, to most people nearly impossible. Those who see the need for improvement understand that nothing but a fundamental change in human behavior will suffice adequately to achieve the change. "You can't change human nature" is so firmly imbedded in the human consciousness that we will hardly think of it as a possibility, much less act upon it with the reasonable conviction that the change can be made. Those to whom it appears as an eventual possibility express the judgment that great patience is required, for "progress is and always has been slow."

I believe, however, that these attitudes are largely the result of our failure to see unethical human behavior as the cause of its remote and undesirable ef-

fects, as well as our lack of conviction that such underlying human behavior can and should be changed.

But in international relations no police power and no effective code of law exist upon which to rely for the necessary restraint to keep the baneful results of economic selfishness under control. In this field of human functioning we fall back upon the use of force to sustain our position, and wars are the result. International commerce and trade operate, then, upon the selfish principle with nations as units, without the provision of an institution planned to cushion their undesirable results. Indeed, the whole history of mankind adequately reveals the acceptance of the idea of "preparedness" against the possible and even expected demands of other nations. *Here is where the seed of wars is sown.* For the "have" nations, it is conceived as a defense; for the "have-not" nations, it is aggression. But for the people of both groups, it is brutal human slaughter with all its attendant chaos, burdens, suffering; a degrading example of mass murder and interference with the constructive purposes of the arts, the sciences, and human progress.

A rational judgment would seem to be warranted, then, that our selfish economic system contains the element that bears a heavy responsibility for the greatest human fallacy and crime, called war. It would seem equally reasonable to express the judgment that the two are as inseparable as light and shadow.

Do we want the profit system? If the answer is "yes," then wars recurring at intervals are our sentence. Are we determined to rid the world of wars? If the answer is "yes," then we must deal with its causes, primary among which is our economic system. Peace workers will see herein an important underlying reason why the longing for peace fails to be translated into the accomplishment of peace. For better results and eventual success in this crusade to eradicate wars, we must learn to understand who are our enemies.

Existing conditions and institutions are man-made. They are our own tools with which we build what we use for the process of living. Just as we made them, we can unmake them and make others. But let no man destroy them until he has better ones to offer. Most of those that have been proposed would not change the basis of selfishness, but merely place the controls in other hands. The better tools must of necessity be the result of better ethical behavior. It is to the soundness of the foundation that we must look for the soundness of the structure of human society.

The paramount need of humanity is character reform of individuals and groups, based upon sound ethical principles. The establishment of the agency for that achievement will require the highest purpose and supreme intelligence of mankind. May the realization of the bigness of the task only act to increase the devotion and efforts of all workers for peace. No other body of men and women has a stronger hold upon the conviction that theirs is a noble work. The peace movement may be retarded but it is never defeated. Its aim is true service to men, women, and children of this and every other nation, and of this and coming generations. It is certain to succeed. It is as immortal as truth.

Garden Philosophy

R. S. KELLERMAN*

I was saying the finest things possible about the garden, the fertility of the soil, the super-productiveness of it in supplying the necessities, and even the superfluities of human life. I was praising its foresight, its preview, in anticipation of what man needs at first, and what he would require to satisfy his appetites and ambitions fifty or a thousand years later, not only of his body, but of his mind and soul. Agreeable to all known evidence, man emerged from the soil; he was born of the earth, and partakes of the elements of the soil; and all his food, clothing, means of protection and shelter come either directly or indirectly from the soil. So far as appearance and evidence go we must conclude that all we are, and all we have, and all we may ever be, come out of the garden, out of the soil. There is no other fountain source in sight. The soil is a miracle of fertility, and the mother of all life. The soil, the garden, the field is everything to us—life, sustenance, thought, education, death, and immortality if there is such.

I was paying all beautiful compliments to the garden in the choicest language at my command; but the ink on my paper was scarcely dry, scarcely had I folded the manuscript, hardly had it started to the editor, when the garden, the soil, or nature, or something, or somebody, struck me such a blow of sickness as sent me into the house, made me a prisoner there, confined me to bed, subjected me to great pain and suffering, took away my hearing and punished me both in body and mind for the space of six or eight long weeks! What was the meaning of it? What was it all about? Was I being punished? For what? Why? What sin had I committed against the garden? What was the purpose of a case of "influenza"—for that is what the doctor called it? Did punishment come from the garden? And is the garden the cause, the provoker, the prosecutor, the judge, and the executioner?

The facts of the case are simply that I worked in the garden and on two successive days I got my feet excessively cold. The third day I was sick with "influenza." Now as I am the son of the soil, subject to its forces and their behavior, I logically blame pain and deafness on the garden. What else, who else, inflicted them? And what has the garden to say about it? Has it any denial, mitigation, or defense?

Very naturally, the garden, being a totalitarian, declines to reply. It has no tongue; but its silence is eloquent. It speaks through man whom it has created. And man, viewing it in the light of reason, observes a curious combination of elements in the garden, all active, often apparently in conflict. Not only does the garden produce the good things of life but it also produces the evil and harmful things. It produces foods and poisons; fruits and vegetables to sustain us, and fungi and bacilli to destroy us; and also, curious to relate, the garden furnishes

*Pastor-Emeritus of the Universal Church in Blanchester, Ohio.

antidotes and medicines to restore us to health after the garden itself has made us sick!

The creative resources of the garden, the fields, the soil are perfectly amazing. The garden creates physical forms and living creatures; and it has created in man an intellect and given it an impulse, so that through the brain and mind of man there is created a spiritual universe in which he dwells, over which he presides, within which is a civilization of order, government, music, literature, adornment, and all the natural sciences. The garden, through the mind of the gardener, turns upon itself and improves the garden, the fields, the forests, and makes them yield more, a greater variety, and a better quality. It is the miracle of miracles that the soil of the garden should produce, issue, and create the soul and the spirit of man! I do not affirm that matter gives birth to spirit. But I do say that, to all appearances and to rational judgment, spirit is in the direct line of the continuous, creative processes which originated in the soil and which marched forward to the birth of man. If there is a power back of the garden that creates, it appears to create through the soil and by means of it. But we lack evidence of it. All known evidence makes it conclusive that all things, creatures, beings, including the spirit of man, point to the soil as their place of origin.

Accepting, then, the theory that the garden is the source of creation, I am admitted as a student at the University of the Garden. I attend daily. The growth of the garden is educating me and all other students. We each possess the talents of observation, memory, and reason, and we seem to be left largely alone in the garden of the universe, with mind as our guide. We possess certain liberty and freedom of thought and action, but we are checked at every corner, and a thousand things are concealed from us. What makes the garden grow? What is life in the green leaf? And why is there a garden and a gardener, anyhow?

Since the garden endowed man with intelligence and inclined him to work with intention to arrive at certain results, it has occurred to man that the garden has an aim and an end and an object for all the forms and beings of its creation. And perhaps there is a wide destiny for both the garden and the gardener! Anyway, that is man's best judgment, attested by tradition and history. Man is in the making, developing his talents, increasing his capacity, and building his character. He is a student and a working man, and the garden is his laboratory and source of raw material; and all the time he is cultivating the garden, if he be a receptive student, the garden is cultivating him. Without speech or language, the urge of the garden in him is his guide and his preceptor.

As to my sickness and deafness, I have profited in lessons of health. I have learned how priceless are health and hearing. I must take great care in the future not to lose them. The garden was not angry with me. I had not sinned against it. It just gave me a warning. My illness was temporary. I am on my guard now against disease and death. I have gone back to the garden. In my heart I heard it calling me. I take up my studies again. I am a junior. I seem destined never to become a senior. I can never graduate. No one ever completes his mental capacity, exhausts his moral talents, or rises to his spiritual possibilities. Man is forever incomplete. The most advanced students are always juniors. Not only is there more to learn, but the mind is capable of learning more. To his own mind, when his end arrives, man perishes—a disappointment to himself and a failure in his own judgment. He has not attained, not exhausted his talents, and has not arrived at the completion of his hopes and desires, which none other than the garden infused into his soul.

In the garden many of the plants and vegetables mature by fall, such as onions, potatoes, corn and beans. They have completed their task, exhausted themselves, and they perish. The strawberries and raspberries have matured their crop, the old stalks have either died or die a lingering death, and there have grown up new stems, new plants for next year. The fruit trees have a longer lease on life, but they perish at last having fulfilled their usefulness. But by parity of reason this is not true of the gardener. He does not mature, nor realize his ambitions, nor exhaust the resources of his mind and soul; but he perishes the same as the plants, apparently. He lives through many seasons; he plants, cultivates, harvests, and consumes the fruits of his garden; year after year his talents increase instead of diminish; he knows more, lives more, and his anticipations increase. Yesterday he was in the garden; today he is not. I inquired; they said, "he is dead."

Doubtless he was a son of the soil. The soil not only produced his body, but, also, apparently and according to our best judgment, produced his mind, emotions, persistence, and anticipations, in continuance of the processes of its creative power. An amazing wonder! A miracle to us! No one comprehends the eternal miracle of the fertility of the soil. It seems pregnant with undreamed possibilities. I wonder and I worship! I see the product of an inscrutable power at work. The product emerges from the soil. I do not comprehend it. I am but an ignorant gardener. My little physical garden, one fourth of one acre, has become the landmark and the symbol of the greater garden of my mind which is without limit of space, and is timeless. In the garden of my mind there spring thoughts, emotions, yearnings, more real and substantial than the roses and the berries in my little plot of earth. I do not understand. The roses and the berries perish in the fall. But in the winter, at my desk, my mind and soul are never so alive with thoughts and things of the universe and of the civilization of mental and spiritual nations, their peoples, and their future destinations. And I am wondering what the prodigality of the garden has in store for us, and how it will give us grace to fulfill our capacities, attain our desires, and exhaust the power of our faculties. And when we arrive at the end of the eternal rainbow will the end of the rainbow be there? It was never there here! I work on in my garden without regret of the past or fear of the future. The garden will see me through. And when Old Father time with his scythe upon his arm comes to cut me down, and when he raps on the door of my dwelling, tell him that I am "at work in the garden, and please to call when I have leisure!"

Trumpets on New Horizons

Prayer for Brains

God give humanity more love,
  Its leaders bless with brains,
That they may work the people's will
  Till peace in triumph reigns!

Forgive us if we ask too much:
  Brains for those who lead,—
And love within the final power,
  The mass who sweat and bleed!

EARL BIGELOW BROWN.

Spain—1938

After a time, they shall have passed away,—
The flame, the fever, and the tears and moans,
The sky-bombs flashing crimson, and the stones
Of riddled houses. There shall come a day
When all the buzzing diplomats that slay
With wasp-attacks; dictators founding thrones
On gags, and tinselled lies, and dead men's bones,
Shall be no more than words historians say.

Years shall erase all things. Yet what of those
Who hear brusque battle rattling down the air?
Who see the red wound gape? the blood that flows
From comrade cheeks? the slain man's cold, glazed stare?
Though time redeems, how real today their throes,
Their blackened landscapes, their dull-eyed despair!

STANTON A. COBLENTZ.

On a Hill by the Sea

[To Kagawa]

The strong of heart and deep of lung, who strain
Their hardy thews to climb above the plane
Of pigmy dreams, and with each step they gain
Strike flint of will on flint of act and cleave
A trail of service—they alone achieve
Serenity. Apart, upon a hill,
They find a room of peace (how cool, how still!)
Where winds through ample casements move and fill
The spacious quietness—winds off the sea,
The tranquil ocean of Infinity.

JANIE SMITH RHYNE.

Not the Eagle

The eagle's eyes
Are used to storm
Where the tides of the skies
Drift multiform.

His eyes are amber,
His pinions strong
To dive or clamber
The winds that throng.

His talons are sharp
To grip and tear;
His plumes are a harp
That rings in air.

A kite of death,
He soars . . . and sees
Some atom of breath
Beneath his ease.

Then with pinions' hiss
He turns and flings
Down the steep abyss
A plummet of wings . . .

Black lightning, fierce
With beak and spur,
His talons pierce
Blood-dabbled fur . . .

And I, too, praise
The wings that tower
On the sun's ways—
The speed, the power . . .

But for courage, give me
His small soft prey
Living stubbornly
Under death from the day!

Rabbit and lamb
In the open meadow
Cry their brave "I Am!"
Under death's own shadow.

E. MERRILL ROOT

The Study Table

A Biography of the Pope

PIUS XI: APOSTLE OF PEACE. *By Lillian Browne-Olf. New York: The Macmillan Company.* $2.00.

This beautifully written appreciation of Pope Pius XI comes from the pen of a Protestant, born of New England blood and reared in the tradition of New England puritanism. The book is nonetheless as warmly devout as though written by a Catholic, and has not undeservedly received the *imprimatur* of Patrick Cardinal Hayes. Pius's life has obviously kindled the imagination and stirred deeply the admiration of the author.

This volume is a biography in no full and final sense. It is brief in compass, sketchy rather than exhaustive in content, a tribute to rather than an objective study of one of the great figures of our time. Even so it is a work of value and importance, especially in its depiction of the Italian setting of the story, and its vivid projection of the personality of its hero. Mrs. Olf's years of travel and research in Italy, her life in Rome and her visits to St. Peter's and the Vatican have stood her in good stead. She has captured the feeling of the Church, caught the glory of the papacy, and penetrated to something of the secret of the Pope. Pius lives in these pages as a man and a prelate. Mrs. Olf convinces us of his greatness, and, more than that, reveals the texture of his soul. Her book is at once less and more than a biography. It is less in its rather

scant supply of first-hand documentary material; it is more in its Macauley-like portraiture of a towering historical personality.

Mrs. Olf's account of the Pope's youth and early manhood, when he lived in Lombardy as Achille Ratti, is full of charm and insight. She is highly successful here in getting the idyllic note into her story—a note profoundly characteristic of that lovely country-side "within sight of the Italian Alps," and of that happy Indian summer period, which some of us remember, of the last quarter of the nineteenth century and the days before the War. There is vivid contrast between the priestly student mastering early the formidable learning of his Church, and the enthusiastic mountaineer scaling the Alpine peaks with unflagging vigor and sure courage. The chapter describing the ascent of Monte Rosa is a thrilling bit of writing.

There comes further contrast in the two great periods of Ratti's life prior to his election to the papal throne. The first of these periods extends from 1888, when he was chosen to serve among the doctors of the Ambrosian Library, in Milan, to 1918, when he was sent to Poland as representative of the Pope "to reorganize the religious life of the country." For twenty-three years Ratti served in the Ambrosiana as librarian and scholar. Then, in 1911, he was summoned to Rome to assist Father Ehrle in the great Vatican Library. In these thirty years, Ratti gained distinguished reputation not only as a scholar but as an administrator; and in the Vaticana, of course, he came into direct personal touch with the Pope. From 1918 on, all was change. Snatched from the quiet seclusion of library shelves, Ratti found himself suddenly plunged into one of the most sorely stricken and troubled areas of postwar Europe. Poland, wrecked by four years of dreadful struggle, was trying desperately to organize the new nation made possible by the Versailles Treaties. Still under the attack of hostile armies from Soviet Russia, overwhelmed by political and economic confusion, the Poles were desperately in need of wise and courageous leadership. Such leadership was found in the Papal Nuncio. Ratti proved himself a great diplomat, not only as churchman but as statesman. It is not surprising that in March, 1921, he was raised to the archbishopric of Milan as Cardinal, and less than a year later, on the death of Benedict, was elected Pope.

The story of Pius's pontificate continues the element of contrast—one might almost say contradiction—in his career. What we have here is the rule of a Pope essentially a peace lover at heart and a peacemaker in purpose, set in the midst of one of the stormiest and most disastrous eras of human history. Pius in the Vatican desires nothing so much as peace—and wars and rumors of wars are everywhere! Mrs. Olf tells much of the detail of Pius's papal years. She writes at length of the long struggle with Mussolini and the Fascists, and the final triumph of the reëstablishment of the Vatican city-state. She touches on Russia and Germany, and adds vivid accounts of the routine of court life and personal habit in the present-day rule of Pius. But her chief interest is in peace, and in Pius's labors on behalf of peace. She accepts the Catholic viewpoint of what the Pope may do:

> Who in the world is better fitted to grapple in a just and impartial manner with the international tangle than the Pope? There must be an arbiter—some authority whose moral position cannot be gainsaid, whose motives are not under suspicion, whose love and compassion reach out to all mankind as to a common family—some one in whom there is confidence that a just judgment will be a foregone conclusion. *There must be a Truce of God.* Who is so well qualified as the Pope to exercise moral suasion in place of a resort to force?

In this spirit Mrs. Olf believes that Pius XI has been the great peace statesman of our time. "We are still too close to Pius XI," she writes, "to do full justice to his remarkable pontificate." Perhaps too close to assess accurately what he has done and not done! But Mrs. Olf has studied sympathetically, understandingly, and has not unlikely anticipated the verdict of posterity.

JOHN HAYNES HOLMES.

A Study of the Psalms

THIRTY PSALMISTS. *By Fleming James. 259 pp. New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons.* $2.75.

This study of the Psalms is based on the great commentary written by Hermann Gunkel, one of the most distinguished Biblical scholars of this generation. Gunkel's commentary, published shortly before his death, was followed by his equally famous *Introduction to the Psalms* which was published shortly after his death in 1933. Gunkel did pioneer work on the Psalter. It was he who discovered the *Gattung* as he termed it. This term, difficult to render into English, has been translated "type" and is so used by Professor James. On this theory, the Psalter is made up of Psalms which fall into regular types such as: hymns, national and personal laments, thanksgivings, wisdom psalms, royal psalms, liturgical songs, and a special type, the psalm of Jahweh's enthronement. This approach to the Psalms makes them understandable in a new way. The study takes for granted a knowledge of the history of religion, since Gunkel belonged to the *Religionsgeschichtliche Schule,* the school based on the historical approach to religion. The type form was used by Mesopotamian and Egyptian writers long before the Hebrew Psalter developed. This latter development took place over a long period of time, but this phase in the study of the Psalter does not interest the author of this book; he is interested only in the authors of selected psalms.

To reconstruct the personality of the author of an ancient hymn is no easy task, but it is by no means impossible. Professor James, admitting that he has done no original work in the field, takes Gunkel's writings and selects certain psalms from each of Gunkel's types; then he proceeds to determine from internal evidence why the writer lamented or gave thanks or praised his God. The thirty psalms selected are: 8, 19, 29, 95, 103, 139, 146, 46, 84, 122, 97, 44, 22, 39, 42-43, 51, 130, 27, 16, 23, 32, 40, 116, 49, 91, 73, 72, 106, 15. The book gives a good resumé of Gunkel's theory which this reviewer accepts. Professor James has written in an untechnical manner, and the book may well find a place in the study of the average person who is interested in the Bible from the historical point of view.

C. A. HAWLEY.

"No qualification avails so much to a knowledge of human nature, in its good and evil manifestations, as an enlightened charity, for this establishes sympathies between us and all men, and thus makes them intelligible to us."

—William Ellery Channing

Correspondence

From Marcus Graham

Editor of UNITY:

Your special issue on "Democracy" of July 4, 1938, proved very thought-provoking. Of chief interest, to me, was the essay "The American Way" by Harry Taylor, minister. I think he might have given his study a more appropriate heading, since it mainly challenged the whole present pro-machine concept that humanity is today worshiping so much. It may interest Mr. Taylor, as well as the readers of his study, to learn that in answering a letter of an I. W. W. in the May-June, 1933, issue of *Man!*, I stated:

> Foodstuffs . . . are grown only on, and with the aid of, *Mother Earth.* All the belching smoke of the mines and factories in the world, plus their multitude of evolved machinery, cannot produce a single head of cabbage. Nor has any skyscraper, flying-machine, or cemented pavement succeeded in giving forth as much as a tiny head of a radish! I have no doubt that the dawn of genuine freedom will see the worker discarding the cities for the country, as well as most of the machinery now in vogue. This simple life means the natural life. Anarchy is the ideal of the natural, anti-mechanical man.

To those who so often meet with a distorted conception of the philosophy of *anarchy,* the striking similarity of the thoughts advanced by the pastor of a church and of an anarchist editor should prove enlightening.

I only regret that in this very same issue of UNITY one finds Mr. Joseph Ernest McAfee writing:

> Democracy differs from all despotic and anarchistic systems of society in making the common will and well-being the supreme arbiter of differences, the ultimate standard of values, the end of individual and social life.

Is it possible that Mr. McAfee has never taken the trouble to study the anarchist theoreticians? And if he did, can he assert that Godwin, Proudhon, Bakunin, Kropotkin, and Stirner advocate anything else but the very same virtue that he attributes to democracy, a society, as he so aptly states, that "insures freedom to each individual and social group as the prime requisite of the community's existence and healthy development"?

I also find myself in disagreement with Mr. Victor S. Yarros' "The 'Revolution'—What Is To Be Done?" Mr. Yarros likewise brings in anarchism in his study. Himself a former outspoken advocate of anarchism, he has abandoned the anarchist philosophy and now contends that "the State can be used as an instrument of justice and has been so used."

This double-fold contention is open to question. First, the State was born out of brigandage. Its very foundation rests upon force and violence, persecution and punishment—can such an instrument be conceived as conducive to the development, growth, and existence of justice? Secondly, it would be of interest to learn from Mr. Yarros where and when the State has ever been found to execute a single act of justice out of its own volition.

Mr. Yarros comes very close to being correct when he states that "democratic government is another name for compromise." It is indeed a compromise of democracy when it chooses to deal with and through the State, since said institution has been founded for the sole purpose of maintaining, safeguarding, and perpetuating the exploitation and rulership of man over man.

Los Angeles, California

MARCUS GRAHAM.

The Field

(*Continued from page* 162)

lessly bogged in confusion and contradictions.

No matter to whom and for what cause we sell munitions, it helps to gear our economy to a war basis. Presently it must confront the people as in 1917 with the dilemma of a depression resulting from the inevitable final collapse of the arms boom or adventure into war.

No matter to whom we export munitions it means profits for the munitions makers and the strengthening of that sinister force in our nation. Or will munitions for Spanish Loyalists be manufactured by some good progressive, socialist, Keep America Out of War member of the Dupont family?

Those who argue for lifting the embargo against Spain on the ground that it is against international law or American tradition to withhold arms from a "duly constituted government" or "a friendly government," must ask themselves whether they will favor selling munitions to "duly constituted" South American governments, for example, in any rebellions that may occur against them. If not, how are they going to answer those who will then remind them of what is being said now in the campaign to lift the Spanish embargo?

As a matter of fact those who desire to lift the embargo because of a clearly thought-out theory are not much interested in international law and "duly constituted" government. These Marxist-Leninists are against "imperialist wars," but they regard it as a sacred duty to support class wars, wars of the workers against their exploiters. On that ground they want to send volunteers and arms to Loyalist Spain. Between those who honestly hold this view and those who with equal honesty hold that all war is criminal, futile, and fatal to progress and humanity, there is a deep cleavage. At some stage, it is likely to become impossible for those who hold such opposing views to work together in a common antiwar movement. That is not to say that some fruitful coöperation may not be possible at the present stage, provided that there is mutually sincere and strict adherence within the Keep America Out of War movement to the six point program.

If progressives and radicals send military support to Spanish Socialists, then conservatives and reactionaries will certainly insist on sending it to Fascists. Then the United States itself will shortly be torn with civil conflict, for it is childish to assume that these bitterly hostile groups busily engaged in sending arms to their respective comrades abroad will refrain from arming here at home.

The pacifist is firmly convinced that when we help those engaged in the struggle for a just and brotherly social order to wage war, we are rendering them no service. To the contrary, we are helping them to build the machinery of violence, repression, espionage, dictatorship, which will thwart and defeat the very end they seek. Look at Russia. Those who seek democracy, justice, peace, brotherhood, by the method of war, dictatorship, hate, and violence, will get the war, dictatorship, hate, and violence they practise—nothing else.

There is still no greater service that the masses in any country can render to their fellow workers in other lands than to work against imperialism and militarism at home, to make it impossible for the military machine in their own country to operate. It is in fact the only point at which we can hope to be at all effective. Let us unite here in the United States so to aid the beleaguered forces of freedom, truth, and peace in our own and other lands. To that end let us work with renewed energy to put the United States out of the business of selling war supplies to anybody at any time!

Fellowship.

Educational Service

Alcoholfax Educational Service, issued monthly through the school year by Allied Youth, Inc., National Education Association Building, Washington, D. C., recently completed its most successful year of broadening usefulness to teachers, editors, school administrators, and a limited number of religious workers.

There would be real profit to many a church and church school in becoming better acquainted with this complete and novel service, which keeps secular educators up to date in the facts, methods, and problems of practical alcohol education.

The service includes each month except in midsummer: a number of articles, special bulletins, program helps, research summaries, reading lists, all supplied in loose leaf form to fit a standard binder; ten copies of the current month's issue of *The Allied Youth;* reference and consultative service. When the contract is entered, the subscriber may select one standard textbook and one pamphlet from the Allied Youth book list, while other printed items offered by Allied Youth from time to time are subject to a special discount to Alcoholfax clients.

Alcoholfax has been regularly supplied below the actual cost of production, the fee being $10.00 a year.

Bulletin of Allied Youth, Inc.